



Docket No.: 9988.035.00
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Ju Hwan YUN et al.

Customer No.: 30827

Application No.: 10/629,774

Confirmation No.: 7781

Filed: July 20, 2003

Art Unit: 1746

For: DOOR ON DRUM TYPE WASHING
MACHINE OR LAUNDRY DRYER

Examiner: Rita R. Patel

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' BRIEF

Sir:

The Appellants hereby submit this Appeal Brief in response to a Final Rejection of all pending claims that was mailed on October 13, 2006. A Notice of Appeal was filed on March 12, 2007.

The fees required under § 1.17(f) and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c):

- I. Real Party In Interest**
- II. Related Appeals and Interferences**
- III. Status of Claims**
- IV. Status of Amendments**
- V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

06/13/2007 SZEWDIE1 00000004 10629774

01 FC:1402

500.00 0P

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

VII. Argument

VIII. Conclusion

Claims Appendix

Evidence Appendix

Related Proceedings Appendix

I. REAL PARTY INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is: LG Electronics Inc.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Total Number of Claims in the Application.

There are 39 claim pending in this application.

Current Status of Claims:

Claims canceled: Claim 2.

Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None.

Claims pending: Claims 1 and 3-40.

Claims allowed: None.

Claims rejected: Claim 9.

Claims on Appeal: The claims on appeal are claims 1 and 3-40.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The Examiner issued a Final Rejection on October 13, 2006. A Request for Reconsideration was filed on January 9, 2007. An Advisory Action was mailed on February 1, 2007. A Notice of Appeal was then filed on April 16, 2007. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-40 are pending, as in the July 24, 2006 Amendment, which are reflected in the Claims Appendix.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 is directed to a door on a laundry dryer/drum type washing machine comprising: a door frame (see, for example, FIG. 2 and 5B; pages 8-9 and 12) having a central opening (see, for example, FIG. 2), for opening/closing an opening in a front part of a cabinet 100 for introduction/taking out of laundry; an outer window 610 fixed to a front surface of the door frame (see, for example, page 8) ; and an inner window 630 fixed to a rear surface of the door frame (see, for example, page 8), wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions (see, for example, FIG. 2; pages 8 and 14), and the outer window 610 is curved the same with the door frame (see, for example, FIG. 2).

Independent claim 38 is directed to a laundry dryer/drum type washing machine comprising: a cabinet 100 having an opening for introduction/taking out of laundry therethrough; a drum 30 rotatably mounted in the cabinet 100, having a plurality of lifts on an inside circumferential surface; a motor 80 for providing a driving power to the drum; a door frame (see, for example, FIG. 2 and 5B; pages 8-9 and 12) for opening/closing an opening in the cabinet, the door frame having a central opening for see through the inside of the drum (see, for example,

FIG. 2) ; an outer window 610 mounted on a front surface of the door frame (see, for example, FIG. 2; page 8); and an inner window 630 mounted on a rear surface of the door frame (see, for example, FIG. 2; page 8), wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions (see, for example, FIG. 2; pages 8 and 14), and the outer window 610 is curved the same with the door frame (see, for example, FIG. 2).

Independent claim 40 is directed to a door on a laundry dryer/drum type washing machine comprising: a door frame (see, for example, FIG. 2 and 5B) having a central opening; an outer window 610 fixed to a front surface of the door frame (see, for example, page 8); and an inner window 630 fixed to a rear surface of the door frame (see, for example, page 8), wherein the door frame has a curved outer surface, and the outer window is curved such that the curve of the outer window conforms to the curve of the outer surface of the door frame (see, for example, FIG. 2).

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

(A) Whether claims 1, 3-9, 12, 13, 15-30, 34, 35, and 37-40 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,195,647, issued to *Studt* (hereinafter *Studt*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,799,647, issued to *Mills* (hereinafter *Mills*).

(B) Whether claims 10 and 11 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, and further in view of EP 0851177 (hereinafter *Faccoli*).

(C) Whether claims 14 and 36 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,109,277, issued to *Linton* (hereinafter *Linton*).

(D) Whether claim 31 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,223,276, issued to *Gebhardt* (hereinafter *Gebhardt*).

(E) Whether claims 32 and 33 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Faccoli*, and further in view of *Gebhardt*.

VII. ARGUMENT

A. The Examiner improperly rejected claims 1, 3-9, 12, 13, 15-30, 34, 35, and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,195,647, issued to *Studt* (hereinafter *Studt*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,799,647, issued to *Mills* (hereinafter *Mills*).

Independent claim 1 recites a door comprising, inter alia, “a door frame” and “an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.” Nothing in *Studt* and *Mills*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features, as recited.

In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner acknowledges that *Studt* fails to disclose at least the aforementioned features. Thus, the Examiner relies upon *Mills* to cure the deficiencies of *Studt*. However, *Mills* fails to supply the deficiencies of *Studt*. For example, *Mills* fails to disclose a “door frame” and an “outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame,” as recited.

In contrast, *Mills* discloses that a “frame 18 is preferably made of a one-piece strip of metal or other flexible, bendable material which is bent into *the rectangular form* shown.” (*Mills*, col. 2, lines 11–13, *emphasis added*). That is, *Mills* contemplates the use of a flexible,

bendable material for the purposes of extending around the periphery of rectangular window panels 14, 16. See *Mills* at Figure 2. In other words, the flexibility of the frame, as disclosed by *Mills*, refers to being able to manufacture the frame of a one-piece strip of metal in correspondence with the size and outline of the panels. See *Mills* at column 2, lines 5-10.

In contrast to the Examiner's assertions, the flexibility of frame 18, as disclosed by *Mills*, does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a door frame that has "a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame," at least since *Mills* never contemplates the use of a bendable material to provide a door frame having a "front surface curved in left/right directions," and an "outer window [that] is curved the same with the door frame," as recited in the claims. This is further evidenced by the lack of any disclosure or suggestion in *Mills* regarding Appellants' claimed features.

Mills also fails to disclose "an outer window that is curved ...", as recited. Rather, *Mills* discloses that "[t]he [glass] panels 14 and 16 are of *identical rectangular size and shape* and are in spaced *parallel planes* ... [t]he top and bottom side edges of the two panels are respectively in opposed *parallel relation* to one another, as are the right and left edges thereof." (*Mills*, col. 2, lines 5-9, *emphasis added*). See *Mills* at Figure 1-3 and 8. Moreover, in sharp contrast to a window that is curved, *Mills* discloses panels 14, 16 that are flat [i.e., not curved]. That is, *Mills* teaches away from "an outer window that is curved," as recited.

Moreover, *Mills* discloses a frame 18 that is specifically designed to accommodate panels that are of identical rectangular size and shape. See *Mills* at column 2, lines 5-36. As such, the panels 14, 16 of *Mills* would not require any modification, as alleged by the Examiner, such that they are the same shape as the door frame. Furthermore, the design of *Mills*' frame 18 and

parallel, flat panels 14, 16 is inconsistent with the claimed features of an "outer window [that] is curved the same with the door frame," as recited.

Furthermore, as indicated by claim 1, Appellants' door frame has at least two functions, which include opening/closing an opening in a front part of a cabinet and fixing [or mounting] the windows. In contrast, the window panels 14, 16, disclosed by *Mills*, are only clamped to the frame 18. In *Mills*, frame 18 is not an element for opening/closing an opening in a front part of a cabinet. Accordingly, the frame 18 of *Mills* does not teach or suggest the door frame, as recited.

In addition, *Mills* fails to disclose "an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame," as recited. In contrast, *Mills* illustrates panels 14, 16, which are located inside of the oven door 12. Moreover, *Mills* discloses panels 14, 16 that are clamped to frame 18. Thus, *in arguendo*, if the teachings of *Mills* were combined with *Studt*, the panels 14, 16 would be located inside the door 16 of *Studt*. Such a proposed combination, however, would be inconsistent from Appellants' claimed invention.

Appellants further traverse the Examiner's assertions that the "the frame *may obviously be* bent for achieving aesthetic purposes such as curvature in the left/right directions" and that "although the window of *Mills* is rectangular, it *may* embody a flat or curved surface." See page 3 of the final Office Action. As aforementioned, *Mills* does not suggest, inter alia, a frame having a curved "front surface," particularly in the "left/right directions." Moreover, there is no supporting motivation for the desirability of such features in *Mills*. Furthermore, allegations that a frame/window *could be* curved and/or that such features are within the *capability* of one of ordinary skill are not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness without some

objective reason for the proposed modification. In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner clearly uses impermissible hindsight to arrive at the Appellants' claimed invention.

Furthermore, it appears as if the Examiner's arguments, presented on page 4 of the final Office Action, are based on an example that the Examiner has created, which is illustrated on page 3 of the final Office Action, and not what is disclosed or suggested by *Mills*. As shown in Figure 2, *Mills* clearly discloses two flat, rectangular panels 14, 16 and not the curved front surface depicted by the Examiner on page 3 of the final Office Action.

Additionally, Appellants submit that there is no motivation for the proposed combination of *Studt* and *Mills*. Specifically, *Studt* discloses that the door panel has a "thin upper door portion to provide maximum volume within the dryer 10." (*Mills*, column 6, lines 9-24). Accordingly, modifying *Studt* to include *Mills*' pair of rectangular windows would destroy *Studt*'s intended teachings of providing "a thin upper door portion to provide maximum volume within a dryer." Further, the inclusion of a pair of rectangular windows, as disclosed by *Mills*, on the door panel 50 of *Studt* would interfere with *Studt*'s inner liner 52, which is essential to the therein disclosed *Studt*'s invention.

Turning to the Advisory Action, the Examiner conveniently alleges that Appellants' claimed features are "commonly known" in an attempt to divert attention away from the fact that *Studt* and *Mills*, singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least a door comprising, inter alia, "a door frame" and "an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame," as recited in independent claim 1. In addition, Appellants challenge the Examiner's reliance of common knowledge, as the Examiner has not provided any evidence in

support of such allegations. Furthermore, since the alleged combination of *Studt* and *Mills* teaches away from the claimed invention, it is evident that the Examiner is clearly relying upon impermissible hindsight to arrive at Appellants' claimed invention.

For at least each of the aforementioned reasons, Appellants submit that independent claim 1 and the dependent claims 3–9, 12-13, 15–30, 34-35, and 37 are allowable over the combination of *Studt* and *Mills*.

Additionally, Appellants submit that the dependent claims 15 and 35 are also allowable over *Studt* and *Mills* for the features recited therein. Claim 15 recites “wherein the door frame further includes an outer door frame having a central first opening, and an inner door frame having a second opening in communication with the first opening, and joined to a rear side of the outer door frame.” *Studt* fails to disclose at least these features. In contrast, *Studt* discloses a solid door panel 50. Door panel 50, however, is not a door frame and does not have any openings. Thus, *Studt* fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the door frame, as recited in claim 15. Further, *Mills* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Studt*. Rather, *Mills* discloses a frame 18 that is preferably made of a one-piece strip of metal or other flexible, bendable material. See *Mills* at column 2, lines 10-14. That is, *Mills* also fails to disclose or suggest at least the door frame, as recited in claim 15. Moreover, the Examiner has not relied upon any portion of *Studt* or *Mills* for teaching these features.

Appellants further submit that *Studt* or *Mills*, singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of claims 34 and 35, such as an inner door frame that includes “a width of seating surface around the second opening in the rear surface thereof for placing an edge surface of the inner window” and “a bent part projected backward from an outer circumference of the seating surface for increasing a rigidity of an inner window attaching

region.” In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner asserts that *Studt* discloses these features. See page 9 of the final Office Action. Appellants disagree. *Studt* discloses a solid door panel 50. See *Studt* at Figure 5. As such, *Studt* does not disclose or suggest an opening or a seating surface around an opening. In addition, *Studt* does not disclose a window and consequently does not disclose or suggest at least “an inner window attaching region.”

Appellants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 38 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 38 recites “a door frame,” and “an outer window mounted on a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window mounted on a rear surface of the door frame ... wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.” Nothing in *Studt* and *Mills*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as those regarding claim 1 above, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 38, and its dependent claim 39, are allowable over the combination of *Studt* and *Mills*.

Appellants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 40 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 40 is allowable in that it recites “a door frame,” and “an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a curved outer surface, and the outer window is curved such that the curve of the outer window conforms to the curve of the outer surface of the door frame.” Nothing in *Studt* and *Mills*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for the same or similar reasons as those regarding claim 1 above, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 40 is allowable over the combination of *Studt* and *Mills*.

Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* in view of *Mills* is improper and should be reversed.

B. The Examiner improperly rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, further in view of EP 0851177 (hereinafter *Faccoli*).

Appellants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration. Claims 10 and 11, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable at least since *Faccoli* fails to cure the deficiency of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. In contrast, *Faccoli* discloses an elastomer sealing gasket, particularly for cooking oven doors. See *Faccoli* at Abstract. Moreover, the deficiencies of *Faccoli* are further evidenced by the fact that the Examiner does not rely upon any portion of *Faccoli* for such teachings.

Specifically, *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Faccoli*, taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, “a door frame” and “an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Appellants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11, as they depend from independent claim 1, are allowable over *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Faccoli*, taken singularly or in combination. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* in view of *Mills* and *Faccoli* is improper and should be reversed.

C. The Examiner improperly rejected claims 14 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,109,277, issued to Linton (hereinafter *Linton*).

Appellants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 14 and request reconsideration.

Claim 14, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because *Linton* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1, as discussed above. In contrast, *Linton* discloses a parts washer. See *Linton* at Abstract. Moreover, the deficiencies of *Linton* are further evidenced by the fact that the Examiner does not rely upon any portion of *Linton* for such teachings.

Specifically, *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Linton*, taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, “a door frame” and “an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Appellants respectfully submit that claim 14, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable over *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Linton*, taken singularly or in combination. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* in view of *Mills* and *Linton* is improper and should be reversed.

Appellants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 36 and request reconsideration. Claim 36, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because *Linton* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1, as discussed above. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 36, as it depends from independent claim 1, is allowable over the combination of *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Linton*. For example, *Linton* fails to cure the deficiencies of claim 1, particularly “a door frame” and “an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window

is curved the same with the door frame,” as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* in view of *Mills* and Linton is improper and should be reversed.

D. The Examiner improperly rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,223,276, issued to *Gebhardt* (hereinafter *Gebhardt*).

Appellants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 31 and request reconsideration.

Claim 31, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because *Gebhardt* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Studt* and *Mills*, as discussed above. In contrast, *Gebhardt* discloses a door seal for household appliances. See *Gebhardt* at Abstract. Moreover, the deficiencies of *Gebhardt* are further evidenced by the fact that the Examiner does not rely upon any portion of *Gebhardt* for such teachings. Specifically, *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Gebhardt*, taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest, inter alia, “a door frame” and “an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame,” as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, claim 31, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because *Gebhardt* fails to cure the deficiency of *Studt* and *Mills* to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* in view of *Mills*, and *Gebhardt* is improper and should be reversed.

E. The Examiner improperly rejected claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Faccoli*, further in view of *Gebhardt*.

Appellants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 32-33 and request reconsideration. Claim 32-33, which depends from independent claim 1, are allowable at least since *Gebhardt* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Faccoli* discussed above. In contrast, *Gebhardt* discloses a door seal for household appliances. See *Gebhardt* at Abstract. Moreover, the deficiencies of *Gebhardt* are further evidenced by the fact that the Examiner does not rely upon any portion of *Gebhardt* for such teachings.

As aforementioned, *Studt*, *Mills*, *Faccoli*, and *Gebhardt*, taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, “a door frame” and “an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame,” as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, claims 32-33, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable because *Gebhardt* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Faccoli* to teach or suggest the features of claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* in view of *Mills*, *Faccoli*, and *Gebhardt* is improper and should be reversed.

VII. CONCLUSION

For reasons as discussed above, claims 1, 3-9, 12, 13, 15-30, 34, 35, and 37-40 are improperly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* in view of *Mills*. Claims 10 and 11 are improperly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, further in view *Faccoli*. Claims 14 and 36 are improperly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*, further in view of *Linton*. Claim 31 is improperly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt* and *Mills*,

further in view of *Gebhardt*. Claims 32 and 33 are improperly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Studt*, *Mills*, and *Faccoli*, further in view of *Gebhardt*.

The Honorable Board is requested to reverse the rejections set forth in the final Office Action and direct the Examiner to pass this application to issue.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By



Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Appellants

Attachments

CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 10/629,774

1. (Previously Presented) A door on a laundry dryer/drum type washing machine comprising:

a door frame having a central opening, for opening/closing an opening in a front part of a cabinet for introduction/taking out of laundry;

an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and

an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.

2. (Canceled)

3. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 1, wherein the door frame has a rim projected forward from a front circumference thereof for enclosing an outer circumference of the outer window to protect an edge part of the outer window.

4. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 1, wherein the outer window is attached to the front surface of the door frame with a fixing agent, and the inner window is attached to the rear surface of the door frame with the fixing agent.

5. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 4, wherein the fixing agent is a liquid sealant.

6. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 4, wherein the fixing agent for attaching the outer window has a color the same with a paint coated on the door frame.

7. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 4, wherein the fixing agent for attaching the outer window has a color the same with a paint coated on the door frame.

8. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 1, wherein the outer door and the inner door are formed of glass.

9. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a gasket on the rear surface of the door frame for prevention of leakage of heat air from an inside to an outside through a gap between the opening in the cabinet and the door frame.

10. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 9, wherein the gasket has hook parts for joining with the door frame, and the door frame has gasket holes in the rear surface for inserting the hook parts to fix the gasket.

11. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 10, wherein the door frame further includes a width of seating groove in conformity with the gasket in the rear surface, and the gasket holes are formed within the seating groove.

12. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 1, wherein the door frame further includes a width of seating surface around the opening in the rear surface thereof for placing an edge surface of the inner window.

13. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 12, wherein the door frame further includes a bent part projected backward from an outer circumference of the seating surface for increasing a rigidity of an inner window attaching region.

14. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 1, wherein the outer window has a coat of ceramic paint applied to an inside surface of an entire part thereof excluding a part facing the opening of the door frame.

15. (Previously Presented) The door as claimed in claim 1, wherein the door frame further includes an outer door frame having a central first opening, and an inner door frame having a second opening in communication with the first opening, and joined to a rear side of the outer door frame.

16. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, wherein the outer door frame further includes a first flange projected backward from a circumferential surface of the first opening.

17. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, wherein the inner door frame further includes a second flange projected forward from a circumferential surface of the second opening.

18. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 16, wherein the first flange has a projection height which becomes the higher as it goes toward the farther from an upper side to a lower side of the outer door frame, to form a slope angle when seen from a side.

19. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 18, wherein the slope angle is in a range of $1^{\circ} \sim 20^{\circ}$.

20. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 19, wherein the slope angle is in a range of $8^{\circ} \sim 10^{\circ}$.

21. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 17, wherein the second flange has a projection height which becomes the higher as it goes toward the farther from an upper side to a lower side of the inner door frame, to form a slope angle when seen from a side.

22. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 21, wherein the slope angle is in a range of $1^{\circ} \sim 20^{\circ}$.

23. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 22, wherein the slope angle is in a range of $8^{\circ} \sim 10^{\circ}$.

24. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, wherein the outer door frame further includes a first flange projected backward from a circumferential surface of the first opening, and

the inner door frame further includes a second flange projected forward from a circumferential surface of the second opening and joined with the first flange.

25. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 24, wherein the first flange has a plurality of hooks on an outer circumferential surface, and the second flange has hook fastening holes fastened to the hooks respectively.

26. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, wherein the outer door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the outer door frame.

27. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, wherein the outer door frame has a rim projected forward from a front circumference thereof for enclosing an outer circumference of the outer window to protect an edge part of the outer window.

28. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 1, wherein the outer window is attached to the front surface of the outer door frame with a fixing agent, and the inner window is attached to the rear surface of the inner door frame with the fixing agent.

29. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 28, wherein the fixing agent for attaching the outer window has a color the same with a paint coated on the outer door frame.

30. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 28, wherein the fixing agent for attaching the outer window has a color similar to a paint coated on the outer door frame.

31. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, further comprising a gasket on the rear surface of the inner door frame for prevention of leakage of heat air from an inside to an outside through a gap between the opening in the cabinet and the inner door frame.

32. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 31, wherein the gasket has hook parts for joining with the inner door frame, and the inner door frame has gasket holes in the rear surface for inserting the hook parts to fix the gasket.

33. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 32, wherein the inner door frame further includes a width of seating groove in conformity with the gasket in the rear surface, and the gasket holes are formed within the seating groove.

34. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, wherein the inner door frame further includes a width of seating surface around the second opening in the rear surface thereof for placing an edge surface of the inner window.

35. (Previously Presented) The door as claimed in claim 34, wherein the door frame further includes a bent part projected backward from an outer circumference of the seating surface for increasing a rigidity of an inner window attaching region.

36. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, wherein the outer window has a coat of ceramic paint applied to an inside surface of an entire part thereof excluding a part facing the first opening of the door frame.

37. (Original) The door as claimed in claim 15, wherein the door frame further includes; an outer door frame having a plurality of hooks on an inside of an outer rim surface, and an inner door frame having hook holes in an outer rim thereof for joining with the hooks.

38. (Previously Presented) A laundry dryer/drum type washing machine comprising:
a cabinet having an opening for introduction/taking out of laundry therethrough;
a drum rotatably mounted in the cabinet, having a plurality of lifts on an inside circumferential surface;

a motor for providing a driving power to the drum;

a door frame for opening/closing an opening in the cabinet, the door frame having a central opening for see through the inside of the drum;

an outer window mounted on a front surface of the door frame; and

an inner window mounted on a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a front surface curved in left/right directions, and the outer window is curved the same with the door frame.

39. (Previously Presented) The laundry dryer/drum type washing machine as claimed in claim 38, wherein the door frame includes;

an outer door frame having a central first opening, and

an inner door frame joined to rear of the outer door frame, the inner door frame having a second opening in communication with the first opening.

40. (Previously Presented) A door on a laundry dryer/drum type washing machine comprising:

a door frame having a central opening;

an outer window fixed to a front surface of the door frame; and

an inner window fixed to a rear surface of the door frame, wherein the door frame has a curved outer surface, and the outer window is curved such that the curve of the outer window conforms to the curve of the outer surface of the door frame.

pplication No.: 10/629,774
Group Art Unit 1746
Appellants' Brief filed on June 12, 2007

Docket No.: 9988.035.00

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

Application No.: 10/629,774
Group Art Unit 1746
Appellants' Brief filed on June 12, 2007

Docket No.: 9988.035.00

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.